Case 3:09-cv-00099-WQH-BLM Document 1 Filed 01/16/09 PageID.

GENGA & ASSOCIATES, P.C. JOHN M. GENGA (SB# 125522) 09 JAN 16 PM 3: 39 DON C. MOODY (SB# 231110) 2 JERL B. LEUTZ (SB# 253229) 15260 Ventura Blvd., Suite 1810 OLERK. U.S. BISTRICT COURT BOTT MENN BUTTRICT OF GREEN HIM 3 Sherman Oaks, CA 91403 Telephone: (818) 444-4580 DEPUTY Facsimile: (818) 444-4585 5 Attorneys for Plaintiff 6 NEW MOTION, INC. 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 CASE NUMBER: U 0 9 9WQHBLM 10 NEW MOTION, INC. (d/b/a ATRINSIC MEDIA), a 11 Delaware corporation, COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND 12 OTHER RELIEF FOR: Plaintiff, 13 BREACH OF CONTRACT: (1)vs. 14 (2) FRAUD; SMS.AC, INC. (d/b/a FanBox), a California 15 (3) NEGLIGENT Corporation, BRANDIE MISREPRESENTATION; SMITH, an individual, 16 MICHAEL POUSTI, an PROMISSORY ESTOPPEL; (4)Individual, and DOES 1 17 through 50, inclusive, (5) MONEY HAD AND RECEIVED; 18 Defendants. (6) CONVERSION; 19 (7) UNJUST ENRICHMENT; and 20 (8) CALIFORNIA UNFAIR 21 COMPETITION 22 DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL 23 2.4 BY FAX 25 26 27 28 -1-PLAINTIFF NEW MOTION, INC.'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES, RESTITUTION

CR

As and for its complaint in this action, Plaintiff NEW MOTION, INC. d/b/a Atrinsic Media ("Atrinsic " or "Plaintiff") hereby alleges as follows:

#### THE PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, and having its principal place of business located in Pearl River, New York.
- 2. Plaintiff is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that at all times relevant hereto, defendant SMS.AC, INC. (d/b/a FanBox)("FanBox") has been and is a California corporation with its principal place of business in San Diego, California.
- 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that defendants BRANDIE SMITH ("Smith") and MICHAEL POUSTI ("Pousti" or, collectively with Smith and FanBox, the "Defendants") are individuals who at all times relevant hereto have resided in San Diego County. Plaintiff is also informed and believes that each of Smith and Pousti has been and is an employee, owner, officer, or alter-ego of FanBox.

26 | ///

1

2

.3

4

5

6

7

8

9

.10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21.

22

23

24

25

27 | ///

28 ///

6.

23.

///

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1). The amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.00, exclusive of interest and costs, and is between citizens of different states.

5. Venue is proper in this district because all parties have affirmatively consented to resolving disputes in this district, as part of a contract between them. Venue is also proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a) and (c), in that the Defendants reside, do business and have engaged in conduct intended or foreseeably likely to cause, and which has caused, injury to Atrinsic in this district.

#### FACTS

6. On or about April 22, 2008, Atrinsic entered into an agreement with Defendants for advertising services (the "Agreement") related to cellular/mobile phones (a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A) The Agreement provided that Defendants were to develop a registration process for new subscribers (the "Registration Campaign"). The Registration Campaign would allow new subscribers a way to sign up for Atrinsic's promotions.

PLAINTIFF NEW MOTION, INC.'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES. RESTITUTION

- 7. Pursuant to the Agreement, Atrinsic agreed to pay Defendants \$8.00 for every new subscriber of Atrinsic's services. Further, Atrinsic agreed to pay Defendants two hundred and twenty five thousand dollars (\$225,000.00) (representing 28,125 subscribers) in advance (the "Advance") immediately upon execution of the Agreement. The Agreement designated \$75,000.00 of the Advance as "payment for FanBox to develop the registration process for Atrinsic and is nonrefundable in the event of termination of the Agreement."
- 8. The Agreement further provided that the parties were to mutually agree on the creative presentation and format (the "Creative") for the Registration Campaign.
- 9. Pursuant to the Agreement, upon payment of the Advance and confirmation that Atrinsic had approved the Creative, Defendants agreed to "exert best efforts to complete the registration process for the Atrinsic Registration Campaign within ten (10) business days of Creative Approval."
- 10. The Agreement further provided that, after the above-referenced launch, Defendants would exert best efforts to deliver "14,000 subscriptions within fourteen (14) calendar days of the completion of the registration process," and "a minimum of 1,000 daily subscriptions" subsequent thereto. Factoring in these numbers, Defendants represented that they could realistically deliver 28,125

subscriptions (the number pre-paid by the Advance) within roughly one month of launch.

4

7

8

ġ

11. Each of Atrinsic and Defendants understood that strict adherence to deadlines was critical for this relationship. Indeed, Atrinsic expressly reserved the right to terminate the Agreement if these milestones were not achieved. In such event, the Agreement required Defendants to refund all portions of the Advance "relating to unfulfilled subscriptions."

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

. 18

19

20

21

13.

14.

to Defendants via wire transfer.

first time (the "1st Approval").

23

22

24

25

26

27

28

12. Because the Agreement was in place, Atrinsic refrained from pursuing an advertising relationship with certain potential partners that it had identified as alternate providers. Atrinsic is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendants were aware and/or reasonably should have expected that Atrinsic would act in this manner.

On April 23, 2008, Atrinsic paid the Advance

On April 28, 2008, one of Atrinsic's

-

representatives, Jonathan Smyth ("Smyth"), communicated the

company's approval of the Creative to Defendants for the

- 15. Ten business days later, Defendants had not launched the Atrinsic Registration Campaign, nor provided any explanation as to why it failed to do so. An Atrinsic representative, Jonathan Katz ("Katz") contacted Defendant Smith and stated that Atrinsic wished to terminate the Agreement.
- 16. On May 16, 2008, Katz and Defendant Smith had a phone conversation where the parties agreed to reschedule the launch date ten business days from that date. Katz re-approved the Creative.
- acknowledged Atrinsic's approval in writing, and communicated that "[n]o later then Monday, June 2," FanBox "will launch the Atrinsic Registration Campaign." Further Smith stated that Defendants would "undertake best efforts to launch earlier than this date." Atrinsic's Smyth responded by pointing out that Defendants had received the approval on April 16<sup>th</sup>, not April 19<sup>th</sup>, and was of the view that the ten (10) business day period was already underway. Smyth also reminded Defendant Smith that Defendants had also been given all of the "posting instructions to create the reg flow," and this allows most Atrinsic partners to be setup within a few days. Defendant Smith stated that Defendants would "do all we can to launch sooner."

- scheduled for the first proposed launch (May 30th),
  Atrinsic's Smyth asked a technical contact working for
  Defendants, one Chad Horton ("Horton"), for a status update.
  Horton replied that "everything is looking great" and that
  he was confident that the Registration Campaign "will be
  live on Monday" (i.e. June 2, 2008). Smyth expressed
  concern about making an untested service public, and said
  that Atrinsic would like to see at least a demo version live
  by Friday, May 30, 2008, so that pre-launch testing could be
  performed.
- 19. On May 29, 2008, Horton told Smyth in an email that Defendants' registration system was having problems "aggregating" various items of information for delivery to Atrinsic. Horton proposed implementing an "iFrame" as a work-around, which is a means by which content from one site (e.g. Atrinsic's site) can be viewed through a "frame" on another site (e.g. FanBox's site).
- 20. On May 30, 2008, Smyth stated to Horton that the proposed work-around was not at all what was originally agreed to, and would "convert at a much lower rate." Smyth also communicated his frustration that, despite Atrinsic's repeated efforts, Defendants refused to get their technical representatives on a conference call with Atrinsic's representatives in order to discuss the aggregation problem. Smyth also expressed doubt as to whether the Atrinsic

[communication] so we can keep moving forward."

21. On June 2, 2008, Defendants' representative, Hank Greenberg, confirmed by telephone that the Registration Campaign would not launch on time.

1.3

22. On June 3, 2008, Smyth again expressed that Atrinsic intended to terminate the Agreement due to Defendants' inability to implement the required deliverables in a timely manner. Atrinsic demanded that the Advance be returned in full.

1.8

Zorr, contacted Smyth later that day and asked if alternate arrangements could be made that would cause Atrinsic to reconsider. In response, Smyth proposed that Atrinsic complete the development work on Defendants' behalf, and Defendants' site would display the data via an iFrame, as Horton had earlier suggested. However, in exchange for taking on the development responsibilities, Atrinsic asked that: (i) Defendants' commission rate be reduced from \$8.00 per subscriber to roughly \$5.50-\$6.00 per subscriber; (ii) Atrinsic be refunded the entire \$225,000.00 Advance if Defendants did not launch within forty-eight (48) hours of receiving the completed launch materials from Atrinsic; and

(iii) that, in any event, the \$75,000.00 allocated in the Advance for Defendants' development costs be refunded (since Atrinsic was now the one doing the development).

- 24. Despite the fact that Atrinsic was willing to take over Defendants' development responsibilities, and the data would be displayed via the iFrame work-around (a stop-gap solution *Defendants* themselves had originally suggested), no response was ever given to Smyth's proposal, and the Registration Campaign still has not launched.
- 25. There is now insufficient time in 2008 for Atrinsic to re-start negotiations with any other prospective partners. Plaintiff has lost the revenue that it would have been able to claim this year had Defendants fulfilled their obligations in a timely manner. Hence it has brought the instant action.

#### FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

### (For Breach of Contract - Against All Defendants)

- 26. Atrinsic realleges, and incorporates herein by this reference, the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 25 hereof, inclusive.
- 27. On or about April 22, 2008, Atrinsic and Defendants entered into a written contract, the Agreement.

4 5

6

7 8

10

9

12

13

11

1.4 15 16

18 19

17

20 21

26

27

28

28. Atrinsic has performed all conditions, covenants, and promises required on its part to be performed in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Agreement, save those which are excused due to Defendants' acts in breach of the Agreement.

- As outlined in detail above, Atrinsic has provided Defendants with several opportunities to complete the Registration Campaign in a timely manner or, at minimum, to refund the Advance. However, Defendants have failed to do either of these things, and are in breach of the Agreement.
- 30. Defendants have also breached the covenant of good faith and fair dealing, which is implied into the Agreement under California law, by giving empty promises (which they had no intention of fulfilling) to complete the Registration Campaign on schedule, and later by their bad faith refusal to refund the Advance, despite their complete failure to perform.
- As a direct and foreseeable result of Defendants' acts in breach of the Agreement (including the covenant of good faith and fair dealing implied therein), Atrinsic has been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial, but in no event less than three hundred sixty five thousand dollars (\$365,000.00), representing the \$225,000.00 Advance plus the profits that Atrinsic would have made on those 28,125 subscribers. Atrinsic is also entitled to

prejudgment interest and costs. Further, the Agreement provides for the recovery of attorneys' fees resulting from or in connection with an action for "breach of any agreement, representation or warranty herein." Defendants have breached the Agreement, so Atrinsic is further entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees from them.

# SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

### (For Fraud - Against All Defendants)

- 32. Atrinsic realleges, and incorporates herein by this reference, the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 31 hereof, inclusive.
- 33. On or about May 19, 2008 defendant Smith, acting on behalf of herself and the other Defendants, and each of them, promised and represented to Smyth and Katz in writing that "[n]o later than Monday, June 2," Defendants "will launch the Atrinsic Registration Campaign." Further, Smith represented that Defendants would "undertake best efforts to launch earlier than this date."
- 34. Atrinsic is informed and believes, and therefore alleges, that at the time said promise was made, neither Smith nor any of the other Defendants had any intention of completing the Registration Campaign on schedule or refunding the Advance.

- 35. Atrinsic is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that the above-referenced promise was made with the intent to induce Atrinsic to, inter alia: (i) forestall the termination of the Agreement and demand for the return of the Advance; (ii) refrain from pursuing similar relationships with other mobile marketing partners; and/or (iii) forego bringing legal action against Defendants (such as this lawsuit).
- 36. Atrinsic did, in fact, rely on this promise to its detriment, by, inter alia: (i) forestalling the termination of the Agreement and demand for the return of the Advance; (ii) refraining from pursuing similar relationships with other mobile marketing partners; and (iii) forgoing the institution of formal legal action against Defendants (such as this lawsuit).
- 37. Atrinsic is further informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants knew or reasonably should have expected that in making said promise, Atrinsic would so rely.
- 38. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' tortious conduct, Atrinsic has suffered damage, in an amount to be determined at trial, but in no event less than three hundred sixty five thousand dollars (\$365,000.00), plus prejudgment interest, costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

39. Further, Atrinsic is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that Defendants' actions were willful, malicious, and done with a conscious disregard for Atrinsic's rights. As such, Defendants should be deemed to have committed intentional fraud, entitling Atrinsic to punitive and exemplary damages according to proof at trial in order to make an example out of the Defendants and deter similar conduct.

#### THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Negligent Misrepresentation - Against All Defendants)

- 40. Atrinsic realleges, and incorporates herein by this reference, the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 39 hereof, inclusive.
- 41. Smith, acting on behalf of both herself and the other Defendants, and each of them, had no reasonable grounds for believing that her representations regarding the launch of the Registration Campaign were true, and instead made them with the intent to induce Atrinsic to act in detrimental reliance as herein alleged.
- 42. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' negligent conduct, Atrinsic has suffered damage in an amount to be determined at trial, but in no event less than three hundred sixty five thousand dollars

(\$365,000.00), plus prejudgment interest, costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

### FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Promissory Estoppel - Against All Defendants)

6. 

43. Atrinsic realleges, and incorporates herein by this reference, the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 42 hereof, inclusive.

fees.

44. As a direct and foreseeable result of Defendants' promise, Atrinsic has suffered damage, in an amount to be determined at trial, but in no event less than three hundred sixty five thousand dollars (\$365,000.00), plus prejudgment interest, costs and reasonable attorneys'

45. Injustice can be avoided only by enforcing Defendants' promise completely.

## FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Money Had and Received - Against All Defendants)

46. Atrinsic realleges, and incorporates herein by this reference, the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 45 hereof, inclusive.

50 hereof, inclusive.

- 52. On or about April 23, 2008, Atrinsic wired the two hundred and twenty five thousand dollar (\$225,000.00) Advance to Defendants pursuant to the Agreement. Defendants were then obligated to use their best efforts to launch the Registration Campaign within the time allotted in the Agreement. Defendants further agreed, in the event that the Registration Campaign was not launched on schedule, to return the Advance to Atrinsic.
- 53. Despite the fact that the Registration Campaign was not launched on schedule (or at all), Defendants still retains possession of the two hundred and twenty five thousand dollar (\$225,000.00) Advance.
- 54. Atrinsic has demanded payment of this money from Defendants, but to no avail. The last demand was made on or about June 26, 2008.
- 55. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful exercise of dominion over the Advance, Atrinsic has been damaged, in an amount to be determined at trial but in no event less than the converted sum of two hundred twenty five thousand dollars (\$225,000.00), plus prejudgment interest and the costs of recovering said sum, along with reasonable attorneys' fees.
- 56. Further, Atrinsic is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that Defendants' acts of

1.9

conversion were willful, malicious, and done with a conscious disregard for Atrinsic's rights. As such, Atrinsic is entitled to punitive and exemplary damages according to proof at trial in order to make an example out of the Defendants and deter similar conduct.

#### SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Unjust Enrichment - Against All Defendants)

- 57. Atrinsic realleges, and incorporates herein by this reference, the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 56 hereof, inclusive.
- 58. As set forth above, Atrinsic paid the Advance to Defendants pursuant to the Agreement, with the reasonable expectation that Defendants would either launch the Registration Campaign on schedule or, at minimum, return the Advance to Atrinsic.
- 59. The Registration Campaign did not launch on schedule (or at all), yet Defendants still have not refunded the Advance.
- 60. Defendants voluntarily accepted and benefitted from the Advance, and it would be inequitable and unconscionable to allow them to continue to do so, despite their complete failure to satisfy their obligations or provide any benefit whatsoever to Atrinsic.

of the Advance, as well as disgorgement of any profits, gains and advantages obtained via Defendants' use and enjoyment thereof, the exact amount of which is extremely difficult to calculate and is presently unknown, but which will be proven at trial in an amount exceeding the jurisdictional minimum of this Court.

#### EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(California Unfair Competition - Against All Defendants)

- 62. Atrinsic realleges, and incorporates herein by this reference, the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 61 hereof, inclusive.
- 63. Defendants' unlawful and fraudulent conduct constitutes unfair competition, within the meaning of Business and Professions Code Section 17203.
- 64. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unfair competition, Atrinsic has suffered and continues to suffer injury in fact by losing money and/or property in an amount to be proven at trial, but in no event less than the jurisdictional minimum of this Court.
- 65. Atrinsic is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that Defendants' have obtained certain profits, gains and advantages as a result of their unfair

- 1	+						
	<b>÷</b>						
	. 1	<ul> <li>for compensatory damages in an amount to be</li> </ul>					
	2	proven at trial, but in no event less than					
	3	three hundred sixty five thousand dollars					
	4	(\$365,000.00);					
	5						
	6	to be proven at trial;					
	7						
	8						
	9	• for prejudgment interest and costs of surt;					
	10	<ul><li>for reasonable attorneys' fees;</li></ul>					
	11	3. On the Fifth, Seventh and Eighth causes of action:					
	12	<ul> <li>for restitution of the \$225,000.00 Advance;</li> <li>for disgorgement of any profits, gains or advantages wrongfully obtained by Defendants;</li> <li>for prejudgment interest and costs of suit;</li> <li>for reasonable attorneys' fees;</li> </ul>					
	13						
	14						
	15						
	16						
	17						
	18						
	19						
	20						
	21	and proper.					
	22						
	23	DATED: January 16, 2009 GENGA & ASSOCIATES, P.C.					
	24						
	25	DM					
	26	Don C. Moody, Esq.					
	27	Attorneys for Plaintiff NEW MOTION, INC.					
	28	MEW POITON, INC.					
Ĺ	<u> </u>	20					
		PLAINTIFF NEW MOTION, INC.'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES, RESTITUTION					
•							

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 38.1, Atrinsic hereby demands trial by jury on all matters so triable. DATED: January 16, 2009 GENGA & ASSOCIATES, P.C. Don C. Moody, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiff NEW MOTION, INC. 

INC.'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES, RESTITUTION

PLAINTIFF NEW MOTION,

SJS 44 (Rev. (2/07)

## CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

The street to phot street. (SEE	METROCHORS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)	9**			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS			
	//b/o ATDINIONO NATDIAN	1		•	
12 V 10 1 10 14, 1140. (6	d/b/a ATRINSIC MEDIA)	SMS.AC, INC.,	SMS.AC, INC., BRANDIE SMEHE BICHAEL POUSTI		
(b) County of Residence	c of First Listed Plaintiff Rockland (NY)		of First Listed Defendant		
	EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)	Config of Residence C	IN US PLANTIFF CASES	ONT YO	
,		NOTE	東原原である ACAIN THE CASES DD CONDEMNATION CASES, U	ONLY)	
•					
•	,			MILM	
(c) Attorney's (Firm Nair	ne, Address, and Telephone Number)	Attorneys (If Knb)	9 CV 009 9V	NOHRIM	
ENGA & ASSOCIATE	ES, P.C., 15260 VENTURA BLVD., SUI	TE N/A		TOPPEN	
810 SHERMAN OAK	S, CA 91403, 818-444-4580	IE N/A	•	DVEAT	
II. BASIS OF JURISI		W. CYTYCH CT			
ii. Dadis Or Jukisi	DICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF P	'RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
☐ 1 U.S. Government	☐ 3 Federal Question	(For Diversity Cases Only)	TF DEF	and One Box for Defendant)	
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)	·	I M I Incorporated or Pr		
		**************************************	of Business In Thi	s State	
D 2 U.S. Government	№ 4 Diversity	Citizen of Another State	2 D 2 Incorporated and I	Principal Place 🔰 5 🛛 5	
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	·	of Business In		
	(and the officer of the best from 111)				
		Citizen or Subject of a  Foreign Country	3 G 3 Foreign Nation	0606	
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	r or olga Country	<del></del>		
DESCRIPCIONER AVOIDADES	TORRISS AND LONG	OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT		A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR	
☐ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY	☐ 610 Agriculture	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 i	400 State Reapportionment	
120 Marine	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 362 Personal Injury	☐ 620 Other Food & Drug	□ 423 Withdrawal	410 State Reapportionment     410 Antitrust	
130 Miller Act	☐ 315 Airplane Product Mcd. Malpractice	☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure	28 USC 157	☐ 430 Banks and Banking	
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability	of Property 21 USC 881		☐ 450 Commerce	
& Enforcement of Judgment		☐ 630 Liquor Laws ☐ 640 R.R. & Truck	■ 820 Copyrights	☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and	
D 151 Medicare Act .	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Injury Product	☐ 650 Airline Regs.	830 Patent	Corrupt Organizations	
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability Liability  D 340 Marine PERSONAL PROPERTY	☐ 660 Occupational	☐ 840 Trademark	☐ 480 Consumer Credit	
(Excl. Voterans)	D 340 Marine Product PERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud	Y Safety/Health  ☐ 690 Other		U 490 Cable/Sat TV U 810 Selective Service	
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment.	Liability D 371 Truth in Lending	PARTY OF BAROR STATE	ENSOGNESECURITY X		
of Veteran's Benefits  160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 380 Other Personal	Cl 710 Fair Labor Standards	☐ 861 HIA (1395ff)	Exchange	
190 Other Contract	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Property Damage Product Liability ☐ 385 Property Damage	Act	1 862 Black Lung (923)	© 875 Customer Challenge	
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	☐ 360 Other Personal Product Liability	<ul> <li>720 Labor/Mgmt, Relations</li> <li>730 Labor/Mgmt, Reporting</li> </ul>	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	12 USC 3410 ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions	
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury	& Disclosure Act	☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 891 Agricultural Acts	
210 Land Condemnation	D 441 Voting D 510 Motions to Vacate		EXCHERPIRATION X STUTISMEN	☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act	
☐ 220 Foreclosure	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate ☐ 442 Employment ☐ Sentence	<ul><li>790 Other Labor Litigation</li><li>791 Empl. Ret. Inc.</li></ul>	0 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)	© 893 Environmental Matters © 894 Energy Allocation Act	
☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus:	Security Act	☐ 871 IRS—Third Party	895 Freedom of Information	
<ul> <li>240 Torts to Land</li> <li>245 Tort Product Liability</li> </ul>	Accommodations		26 USC 7609	Act	
290 All Other Real Property	☐ 444 Welfare ☐ 535 Death Penalty ☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - ☐ 540 Mandamus & Other	☐ 462 Naturalization Application	·	900Appeal of Fee Determination	
,	Employment 550 Civil Rights	☐ 463 Habeas Corpus -		Under Equal Access to Justice	
	☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - ☐ 555 Prison Condition	Alicu Detainee		☐ 950 Constitutionality of	
	Other  440 Other Civil Rights	465 Other Immigration		State Statutes	
	The state of the s	Actions		•	
V. ORIGIN (Place)	ADM CO. D. C. L.				
	an "X" in One Box Only) cmoved from	4 Reinstated or 5 Transfe	erred from G 6 Multidistri	Appeal to District Judge from	
	ate Court Appellate Court	Reopened anothe	r district Litigation	/ Magistrate	
. '	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are 28 U.S.C. 1332	filing (Do not cite invisedictions		Judgment	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	28 U.S.C. 1332	ming (no not enterful schettona	a statutes unless utversity):		
VII. CAUSE OF ACTION			<del></del>		
	DIVERSITY CLAIM FOR BREACH	HOF CONTRACT, FRAI	UD, NEGLIGENT MIS	REPRESENTATION, 💼	
VII. REQUESTED IN	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION	DEMAND S		f demanded in complaint:	
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P. 23		JURY DEMAND:	☐ Yes ☐ No	
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S)				
IF ANY	(See instructions): JUDGE				
1,K 231 V S,			DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE	SIGNATURE OF ATTO	RNEY OF RECORD			
01/16/2009	1)(1)				
OR OFFICE USE ONLY	LANC				
CONCORPICE USE ONLY	h	<del></del>		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
RECEIPT # \59097 A	MOUNT \$350 APPLYING IFP	Busce	MAC 235	CE	
	T /	JUDGE	MAG. JUD	OE	
/ / /	1/11/20				
1M)	1/16/09				
	-				

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO DIVISION

# 159097 - TC

January 16, 2009 15:40:46

#### Civ Fil Non-Pris

USAO #.: 09CV0099

Judge..: WILLIAM Q HAYES

Amount.:

\$350.00 CK

Check#.: 3055146

Total-> \$350.00

FROM: NEW MOTION VS SMS AC INC